



WestminsterResearch

<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

Book review: Steven Franks & Tracy Holloway King, A handbook of Slavic clitics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Pp. xv+403.

Andrew Caink

School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Languages

This paper has been published in *Journal of Linguistics*, 37 (2), (November 2003), pp. 429-433)

© Cambridge University Press [2001].

The *Journal of Linguistics* is available online at:

<http://uk.cambridge.org/journals/lin>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners. Users are permitted to download and/or print one copy for non-commercial private study or research. Further distribution and any use of material from within this archive for profit-making enterprises or for commercial gain is strictly forbidden.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch. (<http://www.wmin.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail wattsn@wmin.ac.uk.

Steven Franks & Tracy Holloway King, *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Pp. xv + 403.

Reviewed by ANDREW CAINK, University of Wolverhampton

The book's stated aims are modest: to be a descriptive reference book of Slavic clitics, and to review some recent generative treatments. The imagined readers are both general linguists interested in clitic phenomena in Slavic and those Slavic linguists who may be less familiar with recent generative theory. Strictly speaking, therefore, this handbook does not purport to argue for a particular new theory, though in fact, prominence is given to the authors' analysis in the final section.

Following a general introductory chapter, there are three sections, the first two descriptive and the final section focusing on theoretical analysis. Section I deals with clitics on a language-by-language basis, the chapters addressing in turn South Slavic (Serbian/Croatian, Slovenian, Bulgarian, Macedonian), West Slavic (Czech, Slovak, Polish, Sorbian) and East Slavic (Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian).

Section II is also largely descriptive, but marshals both additional data and data from section I around specific cross-linguistic issues. Chapter 5 compares the cross-linguistic data showing the order of pronominal and auxiliary clitics in the clitic cluster. Chapter 6 addresses the position of the clausal clitic cluster, distinguishing between those languages that adopt a 'second position' and those whose clitics appear adjacent to the verb. A final, somewhat hurried section discusses clitic climbing phenomena in Serbian/Croatian including new data from Slovenian. Chapter 7 returns to data from section I that exhibits clitic doubling in Bulgarian and Macedonian, and rehearses Rudin's (1997) analysis of pronominal clitics as functional heads. Chapter 8 focuses on the question particle *li*, conditional modal verbs and the negative particle cross-linguistically. In chapter 9, the authors review pronominal clitics inside the NP in Bulgarian, Macedonian and Polish, with a final section arguing that the determiner in the first two languages is an inflectional morpheme.

Turning to section III, chapter 10 provides a survey of some recent analyses. It includes an overview of purely prosodic and purely syntactic accounts of clitic phenomena in, largely, South Slavic and outlines the problems they encounter. There is a very brief glance at 'non-derivational' accounts before Franks & King (henceforth F&K) review what they deem to be the most promising approaches that take a middle way between prosody and syntax.

Chapter 11 presents a fundamentally syntactic account of South Slavic

clitic cluster location and formation, with additional machinery in the syntax-to-morphology mapping and the phonological component. Chapter 12 deals with a treatment of the question particle *li* cross-linguistically, the possibility in Serbian/Croatian for clitics to split constituents and so-called Long Head Movement (Lema & Rivero 1989). Chapter 13 provides a brief summary for both chapters 11 and 12.

Evaluating first the descriptive, 'handbook' nature of this work, section I is a clear and useful contribution to the field, with generous use of tables to exemplify paradigms. The authors have gone to considerable lengths to add to the stock of data in the anglophone linguistics literature. There is considerable disagreement amongst native speakers about some data (a fact that rather undermines those analyses that are founded on such marginal constructions), so it is worthy that data has been extensively checked with various native speakers, and conflicts are, in places, carefully documented.

Section II also serves a useful purpose in summarizing the data around specific issues, at times pursuing theoretical analysis and at times concentrating solely on re-formulating data from section I in preparation for later analysis. In fact, this ground-preparation in sections I and II undermines the descriptive claims of the book. One example will suffice: the descriptive generalization that Bulgarian always places the clitic cluster adjacent to the verb is interestingly undermined by data discussed by several authors, but this data does not appear in section I and is referred to only in footnotes later (237, fn. 9 and 290, fn. 4). In terms of the analysis in section III, these are anomalous data. This is entirely reasonable in any formal analysis; one generally finds problematic data consigned to the footnotes, if included at all. However, it undermines a little the implicit claim both in the introduction and in the term 'handbook' that this is a descriptive reference book. It is partly that, but partly a sustained argument for a theoretical position set out in section III.

Section II also exhibits an increased casual use of undefined formal terms ('extended projection', 'AgrS⁰', 'T⁰'), which suggests the intended reader is one relatively well-versed in generative theory (though not one so pedantic as to require precise definition of 'extended projection' when the analysis later posits a nominal K⁰ (= 'Kase') head that projects an AgrP in the extended projection of the verb (317)).

The other aim, to 'assemble and compare the extensive range of approaches to Slavic clitics' (4), is an enormous task given the way in which the field has developed in the last decade. Doubtless every researcher has a different list of contenders that might have been included. In general, F&K present an impressive summary of the more high-profile analyses. One substantial loss worthy of mention is that, given the lack of an effective account of Macedonian clitic placement in section III (or anywhere else in the literature), it is a shame that Legendre (1998) receives only a token paragraph with no critique (292). Her Optimality Theoretic account is

revealing because she captures the tensed/non-tensed clause distinction in Macedonian clitic placement by arguing that [tense] competes for second position with the clitics. Anderson's (1993) influential article also receives scant attention (291). Its significance lies not in the proposal of the parameters of 'scope', 'anchor' and 'orientation' (he adopts these from Klavans 1982) but in giving generative teeth to Wackernagel's link between verb second and clitic second (see citation in Anderson 1993).

Chapters 11 and 12 mainly argue for a fundamentally syntactic approach to South Slavic clitic clusters, with additional extensive post-syntactic apparatus. Broadly, F&K's account is as follows. Serbian/Croatian pronominal clitics are arguments that move to check features with Agr heads. Bulgarian/Macedonian clitics differ in being generated as heads of Agr phrases (372) or adjoined to Agr heads (317) which the finite verb carries up to AgrS⁰. The motivation for the typology is the distinction between the verb-adjacency of Bulgarian/Macedonian clitics (stemming from this step-by-step clustering in the syntax) and second position clitics in Serbian/Croatian. Supporting evidence is found in the presence of clitic doubling in Bulgarian/Macedonian and its absence in Serbian/Croatian: in the former languages, arguments may co-occur with pronominal clitics (or be *pro*), in the latter, the pronominal clitics are the arguments. Additional evidence is taken from diachronic linguistics (318): older Bulgarian was clitic second (i.e. like Serbian/Croatian) but changed to being a 'verb-adjacent' language at the same time as determiners appeared and case morphology was lost. The appearance of the determiner 'triggered' the reanalysis of the pronominal clitics into being Agr heads (319). Unfortunately, no historical data is included, and no formal explanation is forthcoming as to how the appearance of determiners leads to reanalysis of pronominal clitics. Further support for the account is found in Macedonian dialects where the masculine singular clitic can double non-masculine objects; this is taken to indicate that gender is no longer a part of argument checking, hence the checking relation has more in common with subject-verb agreement (no Macedonian data is provided here). The account is intriguing, linking as it does the rise of determiners, the loss of case morphology and the shift from being a 'clitic second' language in Bulgarian. However, in the absence of data and any formal detail, it remains essentially a thumbnail sketch here.

With respect to the formation of the clitic cluster, a prime aim of the authors is to defend the notion that the clitic cluster is a result of syntactic processes, clitic order being a reflection of a functional hierarchy. Yet to avoid the array of stipulations that are necessary to ensure the right clitic order both within the clitic cluster and in relation to the rest of the clause, the internal order of the cluster is determined in a post-syntactic Optimality Theory-influenced component. A constraint LEFT EQUALS HIGHEST (LEH) says 'pronounce the syntactically higher head first' and another constraint PROSODIC SUPPORT (PS) requires a clitic to have a host. The PS constraint is

higher than LEH in Bulgarian, hence enclitics cannot appear in first position (1b) and the alternative spell-out (1a) wins out.

- (1) (a) Dade mi go včera. [Bulgarian]
 gave.3SG me.DAT it.ACC yesterday
 ‘He gave me it yesterday.’
 (b) *Mi go dade včera.
 me.DAT it.ACC gave.3SG yesterday

(I am recreating the data intended. Unfortunately, examples (34a) and (35a) on page 431 do not show the verb-initial examples the authors intended.) In (1a), the LEH constraint is violated, in order to satisfy the requirement of PS.

An additional constraint PRONOUNCE HIGHEST COPY (PHC) leads to other ‘second position’ effects. Thus in so-called Long Head Movement (2), the participle does not move to C⁰ across the clitic cluster (see Lema & Rivero 1988):

- (2) (a) Predstavio sam mu se. [Serbian/Croatian]
 introduced auxiliary.ISG him.DAT REFL
 ‘I introduced myself to him.’
 (b) ~~Sam mu se~~ [predstavio [sam mu se [~~predstavio~~]]]

Rather, a lower copy of the auxiliary and clitics is spelled out, indicated in (2b). The mechanics of this approach are not given in any detail. In particular, it is unclear what the lower position of the auxiliary is or the higher position of the participle in (2b). Clarity on these points is surely essential for the account to viably compete with even the movement to C⁰ account, let alone others in the literature.

For any Optimality Theoretic approach, the onus is on the researcher to provide evidence that languages exhibit the various possible constraint rankings. What we are not shown here, for example, is a language where the PHC is higher than, say, PS; that is, a language with clitics that ordinarily require a host to the left, and which in some contexts exhibit a clitic without a host in first position. In the absence of such fundamental Optimality Theoretic argumentation, this account does little more than describe the facts. (Note that F&K appear to independently retain a Prosodic Inversion mechanism (Halpern 1995) for particularly recalcitrant data such as the infamous name-splitting clitics in Serbian/Croatian (348). This mechanism equally predicts (1) and (2).)

The effect of the Optimality-style machinery is to ensure that the clitic order mirrors the hierarchical order of functional projections, with languages differing between whether or not there is a first position constraint. Despite this, a number of syntactic stipulations are still necessary to arrive at the attested word orders: clitics must jump over T⁰ on their way to AgrS⁰ if T⁰ contains a 3rd person singular auxiliary clitic, but they carry the clitic along if it is a 1st or 2nd person clitic (329); the Bulgarian auxiliary *šte* ‘will’

moves up in an ad hoc way to AgrS⁰ in order to appear in front of the clitic cluster (330).

The complete picture thus involves the stipulation of some novel syntactic movements, an OT-style machinery between syntax and morphology, and the apparent retention of a Prosodic Inversion mechanism in the phonology. The intuitive approach, combining syntax and prosodic factors, is surely right, but this is ultimately a rather stipulative way of tackling it. Sadly, the formal precision of the account in chapters 11 and 12 is not always apparent, in contrast to the laudably clear descriptive sections. There are, additionally, some curious uses of terminology: ‘percolation of V⁰ to the top of its extended projection’ appears to mean ‘verb movement’ (326); for clitic doubling to become ‘grammaticalized’ in Macedonian (72, 251, 257) means to move from being optional (in Bulgarian) to being obligatory.

To conclude, despite the caveats, the analysis of South Slavic has some useful and promising insights whilst the descriptive sections bring together and substantially extend a wealth of Slavic data. The book is a significant contribution to the field and will immediately become a much-cited starting point for any discussion of (particularly South) Slavic clitics.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, S. (1993). Wackernagel’s revenge: clitics, morphology and the syntax of second position. *Language* 69. 68–98.
- Halpern, A. (1995). *On the morphology and placement of clitics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Klavans, J. (1982). *Some problems in a theory of clitics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Lema, J. & Rivero, M.-L. (1989). Long head movement: ECP vs. HMC. In Carter, J., Déchaine, R.-M., Philip, B. & Sherer, T. (eds.), *Proceedings of North Eastern Linguistics Society 20*. University of Massachusetts, GLSA. 333–347.
- Legendre, G. (1998). Second position clitics in a verb-second language: conflict resolution in Macedonian. In Avrutin, S. & Jonas, D. (eds.), *The proceedings of ESCOL 1997*. Cornell University: GLC Publications. 139–149.
- Rudin, C. (1997). Agr-O and Bulgarian pronominal clitics. In Lindseth, M. & Franks, S. (eds.), *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: the Indiana meeting 1996*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications. 224–252.
- Author’s address: School of Humanities, Languages and Social Studies,
University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton, WV1 1SB, U.K.
E-mail: A.D.Caink@wlv.ac.uk*

(Received 6 October 2000)